

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claim 1 is allowed. Applicant also thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 3 and 4 contain allowable subject matter.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-4 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 2 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 2.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by US Patent Publication No. 2002/0007487 to Matsumoto *et al.* (hereinafter “Matsumoto”). For the reasons set forth below, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

One or more embodiments of the present invention are directed to a receiving device that allows a function of a possible defective key on a remote controller to be taken over by another key without increasing the remote controller size (*see, e.g.*, Publication of the Specification paragraph of [0009]).

Accordingly, claim 2 requires, in part, “wherein said converting unit is configured to change a kind of operation converted from the received signal according to a request from said external transmission device.”

The Examiner alleges that the converting unit, as required by claim 2, corresponds to the system control circuit 131, as disclosed in Matsumoto. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that Figures 10 and 11 and paragraphs 0059-0062 of Matsumoto disclose that the system control circuit 131 is configured to change the set value of the sound volume in sound quality to a value +1 larger than the present set value according to a request from the remote controller 139 (*see* Office Action dated September 5, 2006, at page 3).

However, the MPEP § 2131 makes it clear that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found either expressly or inherently in a single prior art reference. In fact, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the claim (*see* MPEP § 2131).

In contrast to claim 2, Matsumoto fails to disclose at least that the converting unit is configured to change a kind of operation converted from the received signal according to a request from said external transmission device, as required by claim 2. In fact, Matsumoto merely discloses that the system control circuit 131 stores the function sent to it in an internal memory by relating it to a key (*see* Matsumoto, paragraph [0060], lines 8-12). Thus, it would be clear to one skilled in the art that Matsumoto fails to disclose at least changing a kind of operation, as required by claim 2.

Matsumoto also fails to teach or suggest at least this limitation. Specifically, Matsumoto discloses that “the system control circuit 131 stores in an internal memory the function ‘changing the set value of the sound volume in sound quality to a value +1 larger than the present set value’ by relating it to the F3 key 713.” *Id.* That is, Matsumoto discloses “changing the set value of the sound volume in sound quality to a value +1 larger than the present set value,” but Matsumoto clearly does not disclose that the system control circuit 131 changes a

kind of operation. In other words, Matsumoto discloses nothing more than that the system control circuit 131 stores the function to a key which can then change the set value of the sound volume, or the set value of a fixed kind of operation. However, Matsumoto is completely silent with respect to changing a kind of operation, as required by the claimed invention. Accordingly, Matsumoto does not show or suggest at least that “said converting unit is configured to change a kind of operation converted from the received signal according to a request from said external transmission device,” as required by claim 2.

In view of the above, Matsumoto fails to show or suggest the invention as recited in independent claim 2. Thus, independent claim 2 is patentable over Matsumoto. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 04536/029001).

Dated: November 2, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Jonathan P. Osha
Registration No.: 33,986
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant